

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

eln

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/564,227	01/10/2006	Yukio Ito	19291-010US1 C-686US	7596
26211 FISH & RICHA	7590 01/26/200 ARDSON P.C.	EXAMINER		
P.O. BOX 1022	2	TAYLOR, APRIL ALICIA		
MINNEAPOLI	S, MN 55440-1022		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2876	
SHORTENED STATUTOR	Y PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS 01/26/2007		01/26/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/564,227	ІТО			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	April A. Taylor	2876 ·			
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet with	he correspondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RE WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFF after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perion for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by stany reply received by the Office later than three months after the mearned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	G DATE OF THIS COMMUNICA R 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply riod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS atute, cause the application to become ABANI	TION. be timely filed  from the mailing date of this communication.  DONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status	,				
Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 2a)    This action is <b>FINAL</b> .    2b)	This action is non-final.  wance except for formal matters	•			
Disposition of Claims					
4) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-5 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are without 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-4 is/are rejected. 7) ⊠ Claim(s) 5 is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	drawn from consideration.				
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Exam 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) Applicant may not request that any objection to Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the cor 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the	accepted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. rection is required if the drawing(s)	. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		·			
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>					
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 01/2006.	Paper No(s)/N	mary (PTO-413) lail Date mal Patent Application			

Art Unit: 2876

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

### Claim Objections

Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities: Substitute the terms "is adapted to determine" with the term -- determines -- (see line 1). Substitute the term "it" with -- the banknote -- (see line 3). Appropriate correction is required.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 2 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Phillips (US 5,890,709) in view of Graef et al (US 6,367,691).

Re claims 1, 2 and 4: Phillips teaches a document processing device including slot for inserting a document, which serves as a banknote as recited in claim 1, wherein the document is guided into a slit in a stacker guide; and a braking means having a rolling body which produces a braking force in an advance direction of the inserted document without folding the inserted document. The rolling body is a cylindrical roller, which is freely rotatable along the advance direction of the document. The braking means further includes a brake lever which is butted against a circumferential surface of

Art Unit: 2876

the rolling body, and an energizing member which energizes the brake lever in one direction about a lever shaft. (See figure 2; col. 2, line 42 to col. 3, line 45)

Phillips fails to specifically teach or fairly suggest determining that the inserted banknote is true or false.

Graef et al teaches an automated transaction machine for processing a banknote inserted into the machine, wherein the machine includes a banknote validator (58) for determining if the banknote is valid or not (see abstract). In view of Graef et al's teaching, it would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ a banknote validator for validating the inserted banknote to the teachings of Phillips in order to detect the validity of the banknotes inserted into the apparatus.

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Phillips (US 5,890,709) as modified by Graef et al (US 6,367,691) as applied to claim 1 as discussed above, and further in view of Kawabata et al (JP 408091639A). The teachings of Phillips as modified by Graef et al have been discussed above.

Art Unit: 2876

Phillips as modified by Graef et al fail to teach or fairly suggest wherein the rolling body is a spherical body which is freely rotatable in any direction.

Kawabata et al discloses a sheet carrying device having a spherical roller (see abstract). In view of Kawabata et al's teachings, it would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ a spherical roller to the teachings of Phillips as modified by Graef et al in order to quickly and effectively correct skewing of the banknotes.

#### Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 5 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: The prior art of record, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or fairly suggest, in conjunction with other limitations in the claims, a banknote processing device having a coil spring for energizing the brake lever in one direction about a lever shaft.

## Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Mistander et al (US 5,680,935) and Kawauchi et al (US 4,820,909)

Art Unit: 2876

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to April A. Taylor whose telephone number is (571) 272-2403. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 9:00AM - 5:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael G. Lee can be reached on (571) 272-2398. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

January 19, 2007

THIEN M. LE PRIMARY ÉXAMINER

Page 5